UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,583	10/26/2001	Brett A. Green	10013478-1	8143

7590 09/27/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/005,583	GREEN, BRETT A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 October 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed October 26, 2001.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 13 and 17 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because Figure 4 includes the terms "copy" and "copying" in blocks 402 and 412 and should be replaced with terms "scan" and "scanning." Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:

- 404 in Figure 4,
- 502 (application 1 and 2) in Figure 5.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "502" has been used to designate both User

Interface and Applications 1 and 2 in Figure 5. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

- 504 on p.12, line 21; p.13, lines 9 and 11; p.16, line 14.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be

notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action.

The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Line 9 on page 4 states "FIG. 2 is a schematic view of a computing device shown in FIG. 2" but should state "...shown in FIG. 1,"
- Line 10 on page 4 states "FIG. 3 is a schematic view of a scanning device shown in FIG. 2" but should state "...shown in FIG. 1,"
- Line 12 on page 4 states "device shown in FIG. 3 in controlling the scanning device" but should state "...shown in FIG. 2..."
- Line 5 states "...each scanned page of can be..." where "of" should be removed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030048487) and Uhler et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20010039587).

Regarding independent claim 1, Johnston discloses "uploading content" to the user "browser" (p.3, para. 42, 44).

Johnston further discloses receiving selections made with the user browser since Johnston teaches selections being made with the user "browser" and the selections must be received since the selections are processed (p.3, para. 44-47).

Johnston further discloses scanning the document in accordance with the user selections (p.3, para. 46; p.4, para. 49).

Johnston does not disclose receiving a scan request from a user browser. Uhler discloses receiving a scan request from a user browser since Uhler teaches sending "scan" request from a "user" browser and the request must be received since scanning occurs (p.5, para. 62, 64, 66, 68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Uhler before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning method taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49) to include receiving a scan request from a user browser as taught by Uhler, because accessing the scanner through a browser would allow the scanner to be on a network where multiple computers could access and share the resource, as

taught by Uhler (p.1, para. 7). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because multiple users would be allowed to use the scanner and the invention would be available to a broader range of computer users, including those users who do not own scanners but utilize those on a network.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Johnston discloses uploading logic configured to generate at least one control screen for display within the browser since Johnston teaches a control "screen" displayed in the "browser" and logic must be present in order for the control "screen" to be generated and displayed (p.2, para. 28).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Johnston discloses uploading at least one application that is configured to perform a designated task on a computing device on which the browser runs since Johnston teaches applications configured to perform designated tasks on a computing device on which the "browser" runs and the applications must be uploaded since they are executed (p.2, para. 29; p.3, para. 39).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Johnston discloses uploading scanned data to the user browser for viewing since Johnston teaches viewing the scanned data and the data must be uploaded in order to be viewed (p.3, para. 47).

Regarding independent claim 9, Johnston discloses means for uploading content to the user browser since Johnston teaches "uploading content" to the user "browser" and means for uploading the content must be present since it is uploaded to the user "browser" (p.3, para. 42, 44).

Johnston further discloses means for receiving selections made with the user browser since Johnston teaches selections being made with the user "browser" and means for receiving the selections must be present since the selections are processed (p.3, para. 44-47).

Johnston further discloses means for scanning the document in accordance with the user selections (p.3, para. 38, 46; p.4, para. 49).

Johnston does not disclose means for receiving a scan request from a user browser. Uhler discloses means for receiving a scan request from a user browser since Uhler teaches sending "scan" request from a "user" browser and means for receiving the request must be present since scanning occurs (p.5, para. 62, 64, 66, 68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Uhler before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning system taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49) to include means for receiving a scan request from a user browser as taught by Uhler, because accessing the scanner through a browser would allow the scanner to be on a network where multiple computers could access and share the resource, as taught by Uhler (p.1, para. 7). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because multiple users would be allowed to use the scanner and the invention

would be available to a broader range of computer users, including those users who do not own scanners but utilize those on a network.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Johnston discloses means for uploading at least one application that is configured to perform a designated task on a computing device on which the browser runs since Johnston teaches applications configured to perform designated tasks on a computing device on which the "browser" runs and means for uploading the applications must be present since the applications are executed (p.2, para. 29; p.3, para. 39).

Regarding independent claim 13, Johnston discloses logic configured to upload content to the user browser since Johnston teaches "uploading content" to the user "browser" and logic configured to upload the content must be present since it is uploaded to the user "browser" (p.3, para. 42, 44; p.5, para. 62).

Johnston further discloses logic configured to receive selections made with the user browser since Johnston teaches selections being made with the user "browser" and logic configured to receive the selections must be present since the selections are processed (p.3, para. 44-47; p.5, para. 62).

Johnston further discloses logic configured to scan the document in accordance with the user selections since Johnston teaches scanning the document in accordance with user selections and logic must be configured to scan the document since scanning occurs (p.3, para. 46; p.4, para. 49; p.5, para. 62).

Johnston does not disclose claims logic configured to receive a scan request from a user browser. Uhler discloses logic configured to receive a scan request from a user browser since Uhler teaches sending "scan" request from a "user" browser and logic must be present to receive the request since scanning occurs (p.5, para. 62, 64, 66, 68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Uhler before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning system and software taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49; p.5, para. 62) to include logic configured to receive a scan request from a user browser as taught by Uhler, because accessing the scanner through a browser would allow the scanner to be on a network where multiple computers could access and share the resource, as taught by Uhler (p.1, para. 7). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because multiple users would be allowed to use the scanner and the invention would be available to a broader range of computer users, including those users who do not own scanners but utilize those on a network.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Johnston discloses logic configured to upload at least one application that is configured to perform a designated task on a computing device on which the browser runs since Johnston teaches applications configured to perform designated tasks on a computing device on which the "browser" runs and logic configured to upload the applications must be present since the applications are executed (p.2, para. 29; p.3, para. 39).

9. Claims 4-5, 7-8, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030048487), Uhler et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20010039587) and Dance et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020076111).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Johnston does not teach at least one application is configured to perform optical character recognition on the scanned document. Dance discloses an "application configured" to perform optical character recognition on a scanned document (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning method taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54) to include an application configured to perform optical character recognition on a scanned document as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Johnston does not teach at least one application is configured to locate an optical character recognition module of a computing

device on which the browser runs. Dance discloses locating an optical character recognition module of a computing device on which the browser runs since Dance teaches an optical character recognition "module" and the optical character recognition "module" must be located since optical character recognition occurs (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning method taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54) to include an application configured to locate an optical character recognition module of a computing device on which the browser runs as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Johnston does not teach performing optical character recognition on the scanned document. Dance discloses performing optical character recognition on a scanned document (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning method taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54)

to include performing optical character recognition on a scanned document as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Johnston does not teach uploading an optically character recognized document to the user browser for viewing. Dance discloses uploading an optically character recognized document to the user browser for viewing since Dance teaches viewing the optically character recognized document and the document must be uploaded since it is viewed (p.2, para. 31, 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning method taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54) to include uploading an optically character recognized document to the user browser for viewing as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character

recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Johnston does not teach means for performing optical character recognition on the scanned document. Dance discloses means for performing optical character recognition on a scanned document since Dance teaches performing optical character recognition on a scanned document and means for performing optical character recognition must be present since it is performed (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning method taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54) to include means for performing optical character recognition on a scanned document as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Johnston does not teach logic configured to perform optical character recognition on the scanned document. Dance discloses logic configured to perform optical character recognition on a scanned

document since Dance teaches performing optical character recognition on a scanned document and logic configured to perform optical character recognition must be present since it is performed (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning method taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54; p.5, para. 62) to include logic configured to perform optical character recognition on a scanned document as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

10. Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030048487), Uhler et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20010039587) and Somashekar et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020116477).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Johnston does not teach the means for uploading content to the user browser comprises an embedded server. Somashekar discloses an embedded server "uploading content" (p.1, para. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Somashekar before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning system taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54) to include an embedded server uploading content as taught by Somashekar, because utilizing an embedded server allows for services to be maintained and administered at a central location which simplifies the management of devices, as taught by Somashekar (p.1, para. 8). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because users would not have to replace the device in order to upgrade to new services since the services could instead be loaded from the server, as taught by Somashekar (p.1, para. 8).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Johnston does not teach the logic configured to upload content to the user browser comprises an embedded server. Somashekar discloses an embedded server "uploading content" (p.1, para. 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Somashekar before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning system taught by Johnston (p.3, para. 42-47; p.4, para. 48-49, 54; p.5, para. 62) to include an embedded server uploading content as taught by Somashekar, because utilizing an embedded server allows for services to be maintained and administered at a central location which simplifies the management of devices, as taught by Somashekar (p.1, para. 8). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination

because users would not have to replace the device in order to upgrade to new services since the services could instead be loaded from the server, as taught by Somashekar (p.1, para. 8).

11. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030048487), Dance et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020076111) and Somashekar et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020116477).

Regarding independent claim 17, Johnston discloses a processing device (p.1, para. 20).

Johnston further discloses scanning hardware (p.1, para. 20).

Johnston further discloses the scan control module including logic for generating at least one control screen that can be uploaded to a user browser since Johnston teaches a control "screen" displayed in the "browser" and logic must be present in order for the control "screen" to be generated and displayed (p.2, para. 28).

Johnston further discloses memory comprising a "scan control module" (p.1, para. 19-20; p.2, para. 21, 28). Johnston does not discloses memory comprising an embedded server. Somashekar discloses an embedded server (p.1, para. 8,10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Somashekar before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning device taught by Johnston to include an embedded server as taught by Somashekar, because utilizing an embedded

server allows for services to be maintained and administered at a central location which simplifies the management of devices, as taught by Somashekar (p.1, para. 8). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because users would not have to replace the device in order to upgrade to new services since the services could instead be loaded from the server, as taught by Somashekar (p.1, para. 8).

Johnston further discloses the "scan control module" comprising a scanning "module" (p.2, para. 27). Johnston does not disclose scan control module comprising an optical character recognition module. Dance discloses an optical character recognition "module" (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning device taught by Johnston to include an optical character recognition module as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Johnston discloses the memory comprises at least one application that can be uploaded to the user browser since Johnston

teaches applications executed and the applications must be uploaded from memory since they are executed (p.2, para. 29; p.3, para. 39).

Regarding dependent claim 19, Johnston does not teach at least one application is configured to perform optical character recognition on scanned documents. Dance discloses an "application configured" to perform optical character recognition on a scanned document (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning device taught by Johnston to include an application configured to perform optical character recognition on a scanned document as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Johnston does not teach at least one application is configured to locate an optical character recognition module of a computing device on which the browser runs. Dance discloses locating an optical character recognition module of a computing device on which the browser

runs since Dance teaches an optical character recognition "module" and the optical character recognition "module" must be located since optical character recognition occurs (p.2, para. 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Johnston and Dance before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the scanning device taught by Johnston to include an application configured to locate an optical character recognition module of a computing device on which the browser runs as taught by Dance, because optical character recognition was well-known at the time the invention was made for recognizing individual characters in a scanned document so that a user could modify parts of scanned text. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because performing optical character recognition on scanned text allowed for easier manipulation of text than if the document had been scanned as an electronic image.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Method of routing and processing document images sent using a digital scanner and transceiver. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030002068)
- Document management system (U.S. Pub. No. 20020083090).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 703-308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-4124.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER